DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 282 473 HE 020 212

AUTHOR Schuh, G. Edward
TITLE Revitalizing the Land Grant University: An Abridgment.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Coll. of Agriculture.
PUB DATE 2 Oct 86
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at Faculty Seminar of the College of Agriculture "Year of the Scholar" Lecture Series, No. 1, Ohio State University (Columbus, OH, October 2, 1986). Based on paper originally presented at the University of Minnesota, September 28, 1984.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Action Research; College Administration; *College Role; Educational Economics; Education Work Relationship; Higher Education; *Institutional Mission; *Land Grant Universities; Research Utilization; School Business Relationship; School Community Relationship; *Technology Transfer; *Theory Practice Relationship

ABSTRACT

The institutional mission orientation of land grant universities and problems faced by these institutions are discussed, along with five tasks involved in redefining and revitalizing the land grant university. A traditional responsibility of land grant universities was to apply science and technology to solve societal problems. Faculty were rewarded for working on societal problems and not solely for publishing in scholarly journals. Alternative research organizations in the private sector, such as the Rand Corporation, do much of the applied research that land grant universities once did and get public support that universities might have received. The educational functions of universities are being displaced by employer-provided education, which tends to exclude liberal and comprehensive learning. It is recommended that land grant universities turn to the previously mentioned five tasks: apply what has been learned about agricultural development to the rest of the economy; respond to the changed economics of education; train and educate students for the international economy; span the gap between the frontier of knowledge and the problems of society; and give university administrators more responsibility in resource allocation. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"Year of the Scholar" Lecture Series, No. 1

ED282473

Revitalizing the Land Grant University: An Abridgement

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

By G. Edward Schuh

The College of Agriculture
The Ohio State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
G. Edward Schuh
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE021212

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REVITALIZING THE LAND GRANT UNIVERSITY:

AN ABRIDGMENT*

G. Edward Schuh**

The concept of the Land Grant University was one of the great institutional innovations of the 19th Century. As an instrument of economic development these Universities have, over the years, served this country exceedingly well. Moreover, they are widely respected abroad, and in many countries they have been emulated.

While respected and emulated abroad, however, we in this country seem to have lost sight of the essence of this important institutional innovation. It is difficult to understand why this has occurred. Part of the problem, I am persuaded, is because of developments within the arts and sciences themselves, some of which have caused us to become introverted in our respective disciplines. This disciplinary introversion has unfortunately been at the expense of relating our knowledge to the problems of society.

Another part of the problem, I suspect, is the wide emulation of the Land Grant concept within the larger higher education community. We are much less unique than we once were. Moreover, many private and public

---

* Presented at College of Agriculture Faculty Seminar, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, October 2, 1986.

** Director, Agriculture and Rural Development, The World Bank, Washington, DC

universities now do a better job of serving society, at least in being more responsive to its contemporary needs, than do our traditional Land Grant Universities.

Finally, the society of which we are a part has changed very greatly and we have found it difficult to relate to those changes. Part of this problem arises because we need to make major changes in our programs if we are to be relevant to the problems of society, and for a variety of reasons we find it difficult to make these changes. Instead, we find ourselves paralyzed.

The Land Grants were created as a response to the elitism and limited relevance of the private universities in this country. The basic concept of the Land Grant University was that it would provide upper-level education for the masses - especially in agriculture and the mechanical arts. But it carries with it the idea that the University would generate new knowledge and apply that new knowledge to the problems of society. Every area of activity was to be a legitimate subject of intellectual inquiry. In a very real sense, the Land Grant University was christened an agent of economic change and economic development.

As a matter of historical record it is important to note that a major question about the original Morrill Act and the implementing land-grants was whether these grants would serve a public purpose.1/

1/ See Clodius, Robert L., "Comment on Revitalizing the Land Grant Universities," Choices (forthcoming).

Only after extended debate and one presidential veto was the Morrill Act signed into law. This action was a charter as well as a requirement that those higher education institutions be in the service of the nation's people.

It is important to emphasize that there is nothing in the concept of the Land Grant University that limits it to agriculture and the mechanical arts. However, what little concept of the Land Grant University that still remains is found largely in the Colleges and Schools of Agriculture in this nation, and in their counterparts in Forestry and Home Economics. And even there, our mission seems to be changing and turning away from our roots, with a strong bent to a disciplinary orientation, as contrast to a problem orientation. For large parts of the University the concept of the Land Grant University is a completely alien concept. (Try asking your colleagues outside the College of Agriculture what distinquishes a Land Grant University if you want verification.)

As many of you will recognize, I am drawing from a paper I gave at the University of Minnesota approximately two years ago.2/ I do not plan to give that full paper, for it was almost 35 pages in length. Instead, I plan to pick off some of the highlights, and add a few

---

2/ "Revitalizing the Land Grant University," presented at Colloquium, Strategic Management Research Center, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, September 28, 1984.

additional points. As is my usual wont, I will state the issues as sharply as I can so as to stimulate debate.

Some Symptoms of Our Malaise

In addition to the notion of providing mass education for society, the essence of the Land Grant University was traditionally a strong institutional mission orientation. The idea that the university as an institution had a responsibility to address the problems of society, and to apply the tools of science and technology to the solution of those problems. This gave rise to the familiar description of such universities as having a tripartite mission of teaching, research, and extension (or outreach).

An important dimension to this original conception was that individual faculty and staff were means to attaining the institutional mission. They were managed and administered with a great deal of missionary zeal, and tended to be rewarded only as they contributed to the administratively-determined missions of the institution. Moreover, they were rewarded as they contributed to the solutions of society's problems - and not solely for publications in scholarly journals.

A description of most of today's Land Grant Universities is a far cry from that original concept. Today, applied work is frowned upon, or at best looked down upon. The criterion for promotion is to do scholarly

work, which means to publish in scholarly journals. And professionals don't get promoted and receive merit pay raises if they don't publish in such journals, no mater how they might contribute to society by helping to solve its problems.

In addition, there is almost a perverse turning way from institutional responsibility. Professionals are self- and professional-peer oriented. They are concerned with advancing the state of knowledge and hence publishing for their professional peers, not generating and applying knowledge in the solution of society's problems. Moreover, outreach is construed as selling one's services as a consultant to the highest paying firm, even though much of the knowledge extended in this way has been financed with public money.

A second symptom of our malaise is the rapid emergence of substitute or alternative research organizations in the private sector. One doesn't need to look very far to identify a large number of alternative research organizations. The Rand Corporation and the think tanks now located in Washington are large and numerous, as are those in the surrounding Boston and in the Silicon Valley on the West Coast. These organizations now do much of the applied research that the Land Grant Universities once did. They also garner much of the public money that might have been directed to those universities.

A third symptom of our malaise is the displacement of much of our educational functions. When I first went to the University of Minnesota in 1979 I was struck by how much in-house training and staff development private companies in the Twin Cities area were doing. Then later I read a paper by Clifton Wharton, Chancellor of the State University of New York (SUNY), and learned how significant this issue really is. I discovered, for example, that as early as 1979, AT&T was providing some kind of formalized and educational experience for over half of its 825,000 personnel each year. As another example, the SUNY's annual operating budget first hit a billion dollars in 1981-82. The Bell System training budget beat them to that level by several years. It is worth noting that the SUNY is the largest university system in the world.

The problem with abandoning such training to the private sector was recognized by Wharton, and I quote: "They operate essentially without reference to liberal, comprehensive, and humane learning - the traditional goals of schools, colleges, and universities." Wharton's point was that the overall quality of our education and training has declined as more and more of it has been spun off to work-related institutions. In my judgment the issue of training people for jobs or training their minds is also important. Training minds must be a more efficient means of building the human capital for our nation than training people for jobs, which tends to have a high rate of obsolescence.

What ought to shake us from our complacency is the massive retrenchments experienced by many of our large Land Grant Universities. While that is happening there seems to be little reduction off in the education and training other organizations in society are providing, nor does there appear to be a significant decline in the flow of funds to private research corporations.

A fourth symptom of our malaise is our almost total failure to educate our students for the international economy and society that is now so important to us. Our integration into the international economy has increased tremendously over the past 15-20 years. Some 25 percent of our GNP is now attributed to international trade. With that degree of international interdependence, our overall economic performance is determined in large part by our ability to compete in the international economy. That, in turn, is determined in no small part by the knowledge base we have on the rest of the world. But that knowledge base is extremely limited, and we are doing precious little to build it.

And what do we do about educating our students for the kind of international economy in which they will live and work? Again, very little. It isn't necessary to cite the full litany. But what about language training? And what about courses that teach something about the major cultures and religions of the world - to say nothing of the geography of the world? The answer is the same - we do precious little.

Our agricultural extension programs are not a great deal better. We have done little to explain to farmers the extent to which their problems are rooted in changes in the international economy, or that present commodity programs simply cannot work in that new kind of world. Similarly, we have taught them little about their international competitors, or that economic development in the developing countries is their last great hope.

Finally, as major research and educational institutions, we are growing increasingly irrelevant to the problems of our society. I have already touched upon some dimensions of this lack of relevance or failure to relate. What is troublesome about this problem is that we don't even worry about our lack of irrelevance any more. It isn't that we are trying to solve these problems and can't obtain the resources to do it. Instead, we deny that we have any responsibility to do anything about them. We insist that our task is to do basic research - to think big thoughts - and then let the world beat a path to our door. We fail to tailor our educational programs to a rapidly changing economy - and then moan that demographics is eating us alive, or that our salaries decline relative to other groups in society.

What Should A Modern Land Grant University Be?

One of the real challenges we face is that the frontier of knowledge has moved out so rapidly in the post-World War II period that the accretions to knowledge on that frontier are far removed from the problems

that society is experiencing. As modern research universities we want to be on and contributing to knowledge on that frontier. And in my judgment we should be. The challenge is how to bridge that ever-widening gulf between the frontier of knowledge and the problems the new knowledge we generate can ultimately solve.

One answer is to say, "Don't even try. There are gains from specialization and we should specialize in basic research and graduate training." But there are two problems with that as a solution. First, what we know about successful research policy is that the basic research needs to be effectively articulated with the applied research. I cite no less an authority than my esteemed colleague Vern Ruttan in support of that proposition. So I conclude that one essential element of a modern Land Grant University is that it integrate the basic and the applied research under the same organizational umbrella, and that we keep ourselves motivated to a problem-solving mode at the same time that we push out the frontiers of knowledge. I will offer some suggestions on how we might do that below.

On the teaching side, we need to offer a <u>range</u> of educational services similar to what is needed on the research side. From our present vantage point that requires, in my judgment, that we offer a much richer variety of educational services than we now offer. Graduate and undergraduate teaching from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., offered to youth 18-25 years of age, just isn't enough. We need a rich variety of short courses,

offered at unconventional hours to unconventional clients in unconventional packages. We are doing some of this, but not nearly enough, in my judgment.

Finally, we need a stronger institutional mission orientation. It isn't sufficient to say that we discharge our service responsibilities to society by individual faculty members consulting for pay with the private sector.3/ We need to have a strong mission orientation on the part of the university. The university needs to decide that it is going to mobolize its resource to attack society's problems. Faculty should be rewarded at least in part by their success in solving these problems, and not entirely by their ability to publish successfully for their disciplinary peer group.

To conclude this brief section, what we need is to reinstill a mission orientation into the Land Grant Universities. We need to revitalize the tripartite mission of teaching, research, and extension. And we need to do this across the university. We need to revitalize the applied in our mission statement, both in the teaching and research programs. And we need to recover our sense of institutional mission and

---

3/ This issue raises a large number of additional issues, not the least of which is that such a policy leads to serious distortions in our research programs. These issues are left for another day.

mobilize our considerable resources to devise solutions to the pressing problems of our society.

Some Tasks Before Us

To move towards this redefinition and revitalization of the Land Grant University we need to turn to at least five major tasks:

1. We need to capitalize on and revitalize what we have learned about agricultural development.

Agriculture is one of the few world class industries we still have in this country. Most of the others, like the automobile, steel, textile, and shoe industries have long since fallen by the wayside. We need to ask ourselves why we have been so successful in agriculture and try to apply what we have learned to the rest of the economy.

It isn't just the investment in research and education that has made for our success in agriculture. It is the particular institutional arrangements that delivered the outputs of those investments to the agricultural sector. Those institutional arrangements have given Colleges of Agriculture a strong mission orientation. The felicitous linkage of teaching, research, and extension with the prevailing mission of serving agriculture has been uniquely successful. The irony is that this

successful venture is frowned upon by our colleagues in other disciplines as not being scientific enough (!), and the faculty are viewed as second-rate because they solve the problems of society rather than to publish for their professional colleagues. Even more ironically, central administrators in Land Grant University after Land Grant University are forcing their agricultural faculty into the irrelevance of other parts of the university, rather than to press the rest of the university to emulate the College of Agriculture.

2. The need to respond to the changed economics of education.

Land Grant Universities are being displaced as deliverers of educational services at a very rapid rate. We rationalize this development by saying that we are being victimized by the changing demographics of our population. In many respects that is too easy an explanation of what is happening; in other respects it is simply a cop-out. Our problems are much more profound than that, as evidenced by the growing role other institutions in society now have in providing educational services to society.

In my judgment one of our major problems is our failure to take account of the changing economics of education. In this case, too, we have misdiagnosed our problem. We express our concern about ever-rising tuition costs, and fail to recognize that the major costs of going to school is the

opportunity costs of the student's time - what he or she foregoes in income while they go to school. The point is that education is a time-intensive activity. An inherent characteristic of economic development is that the value of time rises as per capita incomes rise. Hence, the opportunity cost of education rises with that increase in the value of time.

An important reason why we are being displaced as deliverers of educational services on such a significant scale is that other institutions in society, including private companies and corporations, have found ways to deliver those services at times when the opportunity costs of the student's time is low, and in packages which enable them to take advantage of them. That means at night and on weekends, and in specialized programs, and for non-conventional groups such as employed women, the elderly, and so on.

If we are to maintain (or increase) our market share of the growing demand for education, we will have to change our mentality away from delivering formal courses and shift it towards delivering educational services. Then we need to package those services in ways that are attractive to potential students and deliver these packages at unconventional times. Moreover, we will have to make the packages relevant to our potential clientale. And it wouldn't hurt if we were to get out and promote what we have to offer, while at the same time actively recruiting students to our programs, much like other "educational" institutions are now doing.

I might note in passing that our Extension Services haven't done any better job of responding to this situation than have our resident instruction people. And one other point - we are not sufficiently sensitive to the value of the student's time. We worry a lot about the value of our time as faculty. But then proceed to waste the student's time.

3. Training and educating our students for the international economy.

There are many fronts on which the relevance of our educational offerings might be challenged. I want to consider today the single issue of how we prepare our students for the international economy in which they will work in the years ahead.

This nation is economically and politically a member of an international economy and society. A communication and transportation revolution has brought this about. In today's world one needs a knowledge base on the world to make informed judgments and decisions about contemporary events and about the choices before us.

This nation is now a competitor in an international economy about which we know very little. Most of our students will at one time or another either work abroad or work for a company or government agency that has a strong international involvement, whether by exporting or by trying to compete with imports from abroad. We will be unable to compete

effectively in that world if we don't have people who are knowledgeable about it.

It is time we stopped viewing international programs as something separate and distinct from the rest of our educational and research programs. When we do both of these things, we will also be able to respond more effectively in a service sense to the demand for such knowledge from both the private and public sectors. Reforming our various curricula so that this new perspective is introduced will undoubtedly require consolidation of much of the rest of the curriculum. But in most cases that needs to be done in any case.

4. Spanning the ever-widening gap between the frontier of knowledge and the problems of society.

We in the Land Grant Universities face a major design problem. Daniel Alpert of the University of Illinois has given us a remarkably perceptive and insightful description of the modern research university in the United States. The main thrust of his paper is that our introversion into our respective disciplines has given us a national disciplinary peer orientation rather than an orientation to our potential or actual constituents in society. This peer orientation, which has been fostered by Federal funding of research on a competitive basis, has in his judgment created severe management problems for universities while at the same time driving us to increasingly narrow and single-criterion concepts of academic excellance.

My perception is that our problems have been caused at least in part by the evolution and development of the sciences and arts themselves. The advancement of knowledge has caused the work on the frontiers of the sciences and the arts to be conducted at increasingly abstract levels. This has pushed the frontiers of knowledge increasingly further away from the contemporary problems of society. Those who work on the frontier of knowledge are thus increasingly removed from the problems of society.

One might argue that what has happened is a logical specialization of function, with the major research universities concentrating on basic research and graduate training and other institutions in society doing the more applied or vocational training. Moreover, one might be inclined to argue that that is a "natural" specialization that ought to be promoted and facilitated.

But that would be an error, in my judgment, and on at least three counts. First, such specialization is surely the road to irrelevance. The whole purpose of research and the quest for knowledge is to produce that knowledge needed to solve society's problems and to make for a better life for our citizens. If we search for knowledge without any expectation that it is ultimately to be applied - to go after knowledge for knowledge's sake (or to "doodle," as some would say) - it can be very inefficient in a social sense.4/ Society will not long support such research, as we are already beginning to learn.

4/ Unfortunately, we tend to take the felicitous examples of serendipity in research as justification for being irrelevant in general in our research efforts. To do that strains logic more than a bit.

Second, there is little evidence to support the notion that specialization of the basic research activity is the most effective way to do even that research. Major breakthroughs on the frontier of knowledge have tended to arise out of attempts to solve practical problems for society. Hence, even though there may be individuals who are working on basic research problems, they will be more effective if they are linked wit people doing the applied work. Ruttan recognizes this when he emphasizes the importance of articulating basic and applied research. The same applies on the teaching side, however.

Finally, if we in the Land Grant Universities really want to specialize in basic research and graduate training, then we need to recognize that we need to be scaled down very dramatically in size. If those are the things we want to limit ourselves to, then we need to be much smaller institutions. And maybe that is what society is already doing to us.

I conclude that if we continue to specialize ourselves in this fashion, we can only expect more irrelevance in what we do and less and less political and financial support for our programs. We will indeed become much smaller institutions. But that is not my main concern. My main concern is what we will have sacrificed for society as a consequence of our growing irrelevance and the loss in effectiveness and payoff to society from its investments in the sciences and the arts.

To circumvent this problem we need to attempt organizationally to bridge within the university the growing gap between the frontier of knowledge and the contemporary problems of society. This can be accomplished if we are willing to consider a new layer of institutions within the university, and possibly a redirection of some units now within the university.

A number of creative organizational possibilities are within ready reach. Thus we do not need to impose major reorganizations on the universities to deal with our problems. One possibility is to create more problem-oriented Centers within our disciplinary departments. Such Centers can draw on existing faculty, but they provide a means of mobilizing the existing talent and focusing it on contemporary problems. These can be the same faculty who are doing more basic research.

Another possible institutional innovation is to create new Colleges and Schools, with their own staff and faculty, but well-articulated with the basic disciplines. Over a decade ago Purdue University created a new School of Technology to essentially do what the Schools of Engineering did in their early days. Within a period of three or four years, that School was the largest school on campus! Moreover, with the creation of that School and its strong outreach programs, Purdue tremendously increased its relevance to society.

Still another alternative is to change the mission of some of our existing disciplinary departments. Some years ago my old Department at the University of Minnesota shifted from being a Department of Agricultural Economics to being a Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics. Today that Department has the strongest applied economic research capability within the University. Moreover, as position descriptions were changed and faculty were brought in with capability on the centrally-planned economies and on Europe, together with its long-time strength in the less-developed countries, our Department was able to contribute on a much broader base to other programs on the campus, especially on the Minneapolis campus.

My perception is that the Colleges of Agriculture more generally could and should be reoriented in a similar direction. Rather than to drastically retrench the College, as is often done in order to develop new programs and greater disciplinary depth elsewhere, resources should be directed to the College as we attempt to recapture our institutional mission orientation.

What is encouraging about the examples of possible reform I have just reviewed is that they indicate we are still doing some of the things we need to do to reestablish a stronger institutional mission orientation, and that we can move stronger in that direction without having to make major organizational changes. What we need is a clear sense of the

direction in which we want to move, and a more explicitly-designed roadmap for moving in that new direction.

5. Management and government in academia.

One of Alpert's telling points is that as individual faculty have become more disciplinary oriented, they have become increasingly beyond the leadership and direction of university administration. The point is that increasingly, money comes to individual faculty and only indirectly to the university. Moreover, the allocation of this money is determined by national peer groups, not by local administrators, and when money comes in in this way the tendency is to free up the time of these individual from the grubby institutional work and permit them to dedicate even more time to disciplinary interests.

It is little wonder that we have lost our sense of institutional mission! And what a far cry from the original formula funding of research and extension in agriculture, which at least gave university administrators some means of influencing programs. In today's world, however, Deans, Directors and Department Heads - the Colleges of Agriculture, Home Economics and Forestry excluded - have very little discretionary funds to use to develop new programs and change program direction.

The net effect of these developments is to effectively neuter university administrators. They would have a very difficult time

developing a strong mission orientation even if they wanted to. They can recruit funding from the private sector to develop such mission-oriented programs, but that money also comes with strings attached to it, as do resources from the major Foundations. Even endowed positions increasingly come with strong programmatic directions tied to them.

The situation is no less encouraging when one turns to the problem of faculty governance. The individual faculty member is king - or queen - and he or she insists on his or her right to do what he or she wants to do. Their reward system is oriented towards their discipline, not towards the mission of the university or even the school or department. And the greater their success among their disciplinary peers and the larger the flow of money they attract, the more independent they become.5/ It doesn't take long before such faculty get the notions that the purpose of the university if to serve them, not the other way around. The result is a decline in institutional relevance, in institutional vigor, and in the perceived lack of value of universities on the part of those who would give us political and financial support.

5/ Needless to say, it tends to be the brightest and best that earn the national reputations and thus are pulled away from working on society's problems and diverted to working on the problems of the discipline. It would be difficult to design a more perverse set of incentives!

The dimension of the university system that perhaps best characterizes and epitomizes these developments, at least in the Land Grant Universities, is the increasingly narrow concept of academic excellence used for promotion and merit pay increases. Unfortunately, there is increasingly only one factor that determines whether a professional gets promoted or receives a merit pay raise, and that is "what have you published for your disciplinary colleagues lately?" Moreover, the evaluation of the quality of those publications is determined not by departmental colleagues, but increasingly by peers outside the university. Individuals can win an outstanding teaching award and not get promoted. They can make an enormous contribution to society through applied research or outreach programs. But that won't get them promoted, nor will it get them elected to a distinguished professorship. There is only one thing that will do those things - publishing for disciplinary colleagues.

All of this is done in the name of scientific excellence and quality. My point, of course, is <u>not</u> to quarrel with the drive for quality and excellence. Instead, it is to challenge the notion that there is only one criterion for determining that quality and excellence. For surely that, as much as anything else, is causing us to lose our sense of institutional mission and become increasingly introverted within our particular discipline.

My conclusion after having spent most of my professional lifetime within a Land Grant University is that we have an institutional imperative to revitalize our sense of institutional mission. Moreover, to do that, we

need to broaden our concepts of academic excellence, and give university administrators more responsibility and more discretion in their allocation of resources. Associated with that will be a weakening of the overwhelming disciplinary orientation into which we have settled.

We can do these things without making dictators out of administrators and without failing to assist faculty members to attain their disciplinary rewards. What I am appealing for is that we take greater advantage of the diverse resources we have, that we mobilize them more effectively, and that we make them more productive in terms of society's goals. We still do that in Colleges of Agriculture across the country, although much less so than we once did. We also can make these choices of mission and program direction by democratic means and concensus building, with ample room for persuasive and creative leadership still left.6/ To accomplish these goals, however, we have to move away from the single criterion of academic excellence, we need to elevate our sense of mission, and we have to give university administrators some discretionary funds and freedom so they can manage and administer a mission-oriented institution, not a collection of individuals who are oriented primarily to their national peers, and who only by chance happen to be at a particular institution. Contrary to the notion that this will denigrate the value of the individual, it will do just the opposite. The individual will have

---

6/ Those who interpret my argument as a plea for autocrats as administrators, in contrast to their preference for democracy, fail to recognize the extent to which the peer review system has undermined the democratic process in universities as well as the power of administrators.

value to the particular university because he or she is important to the particular missions that university has. He or she should be rewarded accordingly.

Similarly, our choice is not between the disciplinary orientation or a mission orientation directed only to solving society's problems. We obviously must do both. And that is what makes our challenges so great, and potentially so rewarding.

Concluding Comments

We in the Land Grant Universities have lost our way. We wring our hands about declining real salaries relative to other groups in society, and about the impact that demographic forces are having on us. Somewhat surprisingly, at each university we consider our particular problems to be unique, without recognizing that we are facing a systemic problem and not a particular problem. Moreover, we deal with our retrenchments in piecemeal fashion, with the notion that if we can just get through this one we will be okay. The devastating effect this has on morale and productivity is difficult to exaggerate.

I'm sure that many of my professional colleagues will be concerned and, yes, even alarmed, at my suggestion that we revitalize our institutional mission and give administrators more resources and discretion

so they can be more effective managers and more entrepreneurial in their program development. Surely, they will say, that is not what academic freedom is all about!

There is nothing in my suggestions that erodes academic freedom. More importantly, the choice is ours to make. My appeal is that we rediscover our intellectual roots and redefine and revitalize the Land Grant concept in terms of today's society. It is unrealistic to expect that society will reward us to do just what we want to do. It is our responsibility to once again make ourselves relevant to the society we should be serving, or else see our salaries continue to decline and periodic retrenchments slash away at us. The point is that the missions I refer to are there for us to fulfill. If we don't pick them up, the resources will go to other places in society where people are so motivated - as they have been doing at an ever-increasing rate over the last decade.

It won't be easy to extricate ourselves from the box into which we have forced ourselves. But we owe it to both ourselves and the society of which we are a part to at least make the effort.

REFERENCES

1. Alpert, Daniel, "Performance and Paralysis: The Organizational Context of the American Research University," The Center for Advanced Study, University of Illinois at Urbana, Champaign, April 1984.

2. Perkins, James A., The University as an Organization. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.

3. Ruttan (a), Vernon W., Agricultural Research Policy. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982.

4. Ruttan (b), Vernon W., "Social Science Knowledge and Institutional Change," Fellows Address, presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Agricultural Economics Association, Cornell University, August 1984.

5. Schuh, G. Edward, "Some Thoughts on Training Agricultural and Applied Economics Students for the Decade Ahead," presented at Annual Retreat, Department of Agricultural and Applied Economics, October 1983.

6. Wharton, Jr., Clifton R., "Education 1984: Renaissance and Reformation," Keynote Address, Education Commission of the States, Annual Meeting, St. Paul, Minnesota, August 2, 1984.